

Katherine J. Ellena (SBN 324160)
kellena@reedsmith.com
REED SMITH LLP
515 South Flower Street, Suite 4300
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1514
Telephone: +1 213 457 8000
Facsimile: +1 213 457 8080

Michael B. Galibois (*pro hac vice*)
mgalibois@reedsmith.com
Emily Graue (*pro hac vice*)
egraue@reedsmith.com
Reed Smith LLP
10 South Wacker Drive, 40th Floor
Chicago, IL 60606-7507
Telephone: +1 312.207 1000
Facsimile: +1 312.207 6400

*Attorneys for Defendant,
Rokoko Electronics, et al.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MATTHEW R. WALSH

Plaintiff,

vs.

ROKOKO ELECTRONICS, and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:25-cv-05340-ODW-RAO

[Assigned to Hon. Otis D. Wright, II,
Courtroom 5D; Hon. Rozella A. Oliver,
Courtroom 590]

**DEFENDANT ROKOKO
ELECTRONICS' OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFF MATTHEW R.
WALSH'S MOTION TO EXTEND
PAGE LIMITATIONS FOR
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT**

Date: December 22, 2025
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Place: Dept. 590

State Court Action Filed: May 12, 2025
Removal Date: June 12, 2025
Trial Date: None

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITY

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Matthew R. Walsh’s (“Plaintiff”) Motion to Extend Page Limitations for Motion for Summary Judgment (“Motion”) against Defendant Rokoko Electronics (“Rokoko”) improperly seeks leave to file an oversized brief in support of a “forthcoming” motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff has not met and conferred with Rokoko pursuant to L.R. 7-3, nor has he demonstrated exceptional circumstances warranting a summary judgment motion more than double the length permitted under L.R. 11-6. Plaintiff’s Motion must be denied.

II. ARGUMENT

Plaintiff has not met and conferred with Plaintiff’s pursuant to L.R. 7-3, and thus his Motion is procedurally deficient. Plaintiff asked if Rokoko would be willing to stipulate to a page limit extension on November 25, 2025, but Plaintiff never offered to meet and confer prior to filing his Motion. (Declaration of Katherine J. Ellena, Ex. A). Plaintiff then asked Rokoko to disregard his request to stipulate before Rokoko responded and proceeded to file his Motion without a meet and confer. (*Id.*)

Furthermore, Plaintiff’s Motion is unwarranted insofar as it requests an “approximately 61 page motion to be filed” – more than double the typical 25-page summary judgment brief permitted under L.R. 11-6. “Given the district court’s inherent power to control their dockets, whether to grant leave to exceed the page limits set forth in the [Local Rules] appears to be at the full discretion of the Court.” *Traylor Bros., Inc. v. San Diego Unified Port Dist.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 40977, *6; *see also Swanson v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 87 F.3d 339, 345 (9th Cir. 1996) (courts have discretion to strike oversized briefs). Plaintiff does not demonstrate exceptional need or good cause as to why his arguments cannot be presented within the standard limit through editing or consolidation. Plaintiff’s bare contentions that

1 he cannot adequately present the issues in fewer than 61-pages is not a grounds to
2 grant an extension. This Court should therefore exercise its discretion and deny
3 Plaintiff's Motion.

4 **III. CONCLUSION**

5 For all of the reasons explained herein, Rokoko respectfully requests this Court
6 deny Plaintiff's Motion.

7
8 DATED: December 1, 2025

REED SMITH LLP

9
10 By: /s/ Katherine J. Ellena
11 Katherine J. Ellena
12 Michael Galibois (*pro hac vice*)
13 Emily Graue (*pro hac vice*)

14 *Attorneys for Defendant*
15 *Rokoko Electronics*
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

The undersigned, counsel of record for Defendant Rokoko Electronics, certifies that this Memorandum of Points and Authorities contains 342 words, which complies with the word limit of L.R. 11-6.2.

DATED: December 1, 2025

/s/ Katherine J. Ellena
Katherine J. Ellena